

REMARKS

The present application was filed on December 4, 2000 with claims 1-20. Claims 1, 11 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 9-12 and 14-18 remain pending, and claims 1, 11 and 14 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding final Office Action dated November 3, 2006, the Examiner: (i) objected to claims 1, 11 and 14; (ii) rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 9-12, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,473,778 to Gibbon (hereinafter "Gibbon"); and (iii) rejected claims 3-5 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,030 to Hui (hereinafter "Hui").

With regard to the objection to claims 1, 11 and 14, Applicants have amended claims 1, 11 and 14 to remove the phrase "as a single file" as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 1, 11 and 14 is therefore respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 9-12, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbon, Applicants respectfully assert that Gibbon fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as specified in M.P.E.P. §2143, in that Gibbon fails to teach, suggest or render obvious all the claim limitations of the amended independent claims. For at least this reason, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a method of multi-stage creation of multimedia content. Multimedia assets are incorporated into a framework as a series of related frames comprising a header frame, a thumbnail frame, a meta frame, one or more media frames and an end of sequence frame. A multimedia description file is created in a template for formatting multimedia assets. The multimedia assets and the multimedia description file are combined in the template through a batch-processing program to create a multimedia repository file executable on a multimedia player. The multimedia repository file is stored on a shared storage device. The multimedia repository file is accessed by at least one authoring session manager for access to the multimedia assets, for creation of a modified multimedia description file in a template, and for creation of a modified multimedia repository file upon combination of the multimedia assets and the modified multimedia description file. For each authoring session

manager, the modified multimedia repository file is stored on a storage device associated with the authoring session manager, wherein the modified multimedia repository file is configured for execution on a multimedia player. Independent claims 11 and 14 recite similar limitations.

The examiner contends that Gibbon discloses the incorporation of multimedia assets into a framework as a series of related frames. The Examiner further contends that the slide show icon in the slide show document is equivalent to a thumbnail frame, the video frames are media frames, and the frame-reference transcript is equivalent to the meta frame. Further, the Examiner contends that a hypermedia document should have a title which is disclosed in the first frame of the slide show and should have an ending which is disclosed in the last frame of the sequence. However, the existence of slide show icons and a transcript in Gibbon fails to render obvious the incorporation of a thumbnail frame and a meta frame into a framework with one or more media frames. Such a slide show and transcript may result from other techniques that do not include incorporation of such frames into a framework. Further, a statement that a slide show “should” have a title and an ending, as provided by the Examiner, does not render obvious the incorporation of a header frame and an end of sequence frame into a framework with one or more media frames, a thumbnail frame and a meta frame.

In response to previous arguments set forth by Applicants, the Examiner contends that a header frame and end frame are evident from the transcripts. The Examiner cites specifically to column 5, lines 40-52 of Gibbon, where Gibbon describes transcripts as occasionally including phrases in the transcripts such as “begin video clip” and “voice over.” It is not clear how the mere existence of such phrases in a transcript renders obvious the incorporation of a header frame and an end of sequence frame in a framework of multimedia assets. Thus, Gibbon fails to teach or suggest every element of the independent claims. Further, while an introduction to the beginning of a slide show and the final for an ending of the slide show may be implied in a narrated slide show, this again fails to evidence the existence of and incorporation of a head frame and an end of sequence frame into a framework having one or more media frames, a thumbnail frame and a meta frame.

The Examiner further contends that Gibbon discloses the combining of multimedia assets and a multimedia description file to create a multimedia repository file executable on a

multimedia player. However, Gibbon only discloses the application of a template set to multimedia descriptors resulting in an HTML representation. An HTML representation differs significantly from a multimedia repository file executable on a multimedia player. The Examiner further contends that it would have been obvious to modify Gibbon to include a batch-processing program. In response to previous arguments set forth by the Applicants, the Examiner contends that the transcription text of Gibbon is equivalent to the description file of the present invention. However, the transcription text provides text for an airing program and does not format multimedia assets. Thus, the Office Action fails to support why it would be obvious to modify Gibbon to include a batch-processing program in light of a template set that creates an HTML representation. Further, Gibbon fails to suggest or disclose the combining of multimedia assets and a multimedia description file through a batch-processing program to create of a multimedia repository file that is executable on a multimedia player, as recited in the independent claims of the present invention.

As admitted by the Examiner, Gibbon fails to disclose the accessing of the single multimedia repository file for creation of a modified multimedia description file in a template, and the accessing of the single multimedia repository file for the creation of a modified multimedia repository file upon combination of the multimedia assets and the modified multimedia description file. In response to arguments previously submitted by the Applicants, the Examiner contends that Gibbon discloses TV programs stored at a web server can be accessed for rendering different views to users. However, Gibbon fails to disclose that a TV program created as a result of multimedia assets and a description file is accessed for creation of a modified description file and a modified TV program.

The Examiner further admits that Gibbon fails to disclose the storing of the modified multimedia description file and the modified multimedia repository file as a single modified multimedia repository file on a storage device associated with an authoring session manager. In response to arguments previously set forth by the Applicants, the Examiner contends that Gibbon discloses multimedia files are maintained in storage associated with an authoring session manager. However, Gibbon fails to disclose that a TV program created as a result of multimedia assets and a description file is stored on a shared storage device and when modified stored on a


storage device associated with the authoring session manager. For example, Gibbon fails to suggest or disclose anything regarding the accessing of a multimedia repository file from a shared storage device and the storage of a modified multimedia repository file on a device associated with an authoring session manager.

Dependent claims 2, 6, 9, 10, 12 and 18 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from amended independent claims 1, 11 and 14, and also recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 2, 6, 9-12, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 3-5 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbon in view of Hui, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited combination fails to meet or render obvious the claim limitations. Hui describes a time marker based on extensible mark-up language for synchronized multimedia presentation, but fails to remedy the deficiencies of Gibbon described above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 3-5 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-6, 9-12 and 14-18 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requested withdrawal of the §112 and §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547

Date: January 4, 2007